VOLUME VII NUMBER 2

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW

A Quarterly Magazine

PUBLISHED BY
THE EASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

APRIL, 1938

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
THE EDITOR
THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW
1808-1818 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE :: PHILADELPHIA, PENNA.

Single numbers, 50 cents. Yearly subscriptions, $1.50

...THE...

CHRISTIAN REVIEW

A Quarterly Magazine

Published by

THE EASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AUSTEN KENNEDY DE BLOIS; *Editor*

Volume VII APRIL, 1938 Number 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

EDITORIAL NOTES 75

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF THE MESSIAH. *By Rev. Jacob Gartenhaus, Th.M.* 84

BEYOND FUNDAMENTALISM. *By Prof. William A. Mueller, Ph.D.* ... 95

A YOUNG BAPTIST INTERNATIONALE. *By Dr. T. G. Dunning, M.A.,* London 105

THE MEANING OF GETHSEMANE. *By Prof. Edward E. Richardson, Ph.D.* 109

THE IDEAL RELATIONS OF PASTOR AND LAYMAN. *By Parke H. Custis* 113

THE LAYMAN AND DOCTRINAL QUESTIONS. *By Thornley B. Wood* .. 118

MEN'S CLUBS AND BIBLE CLASSES AND THE CHURCHES. *By George W. Schroeder* 124

AN EXPERIENCE WITH THE OXFORD GROUP. *By the Editor* 127

BAPTISTS AND FOREIGN MISSIONS. *By the Editor* 133

OUR CONTRIBUTORS 138

The price of THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW is One Dollar and Fifty Cents a year, prepaid. Single copies are fifty cents. All remittances should be made payable to THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW. Address all communications to THE EDITOR, THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW, 1808-18 Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pa.

... THE ...
CHRISTIAN REVIEW

Editorial Notes

WE ARE PLANNING to make the next issue of THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW a special book number. It had been intended to devote the present issue of the magazine very largely to competent notices of recent books, but so many books have been coming in recently in connection with the approach of the summer season, when everyone is buying and reading books, that we have decided to defer publication of these notices until the next number of the REVIEW, in order that a more complete conspectus may be afforded to our readers.

* * *

THERE IS A MATTER of crucial import to the moral, intellectual and spiritual life of the people of America, to which altogether too little attention is paid by the church, the pulpit and the religious press. This startling neglect seems to us quite unpardonable. We refer to the impact of the popular magazines upon the minds and morals of our citizens, and especially upon the souls and consciences of young men and young women. Unnumbered millions of people read, constantly and eagerly, the outpourings of editors and writers, in these magazines, and they have become, with the exception of the daily newspapers, the chief mental pabulum of a vast majority of the American populace. It is high time for our preachers and publicists to understand the real nature and influence of these periodicals, and to make it their urgent responsibility to inform and warn both parents and youth, of the perils that lurk in the pages of many of these monthly and weekly publications.

THERE ARE AT LEAST three principal classes of magazines that adorn our newsstands and book counters. The first class includes the periodicals of proved worth, which represent the highest life and thought of our country and minister to the best in our civilization. The second class is composed of those journals that meet the needs of some large group within the community, magazines that serve the commercial or sporting or technical or agricultural or social or athletic or educational or other interests. They are held true to their various standards of excellence by the tests and judgments of the groups that patronize them.

* * *

THE THIRD CLASS of magazines includes all those of the popular type. They assail the eye and force the attention everywhere. The circulation of many of them is unbelievably large. They have come to constitute a prominent feature of our reading life. They trace their vintage to the experiment of Mr. Munsey who, more than forty years ago established a ten-cent monthly of magazine form and size, and made it pay through the wide solicitation of advertisements. He found a vast public, hardly touched by dignified publications like *The Century, Harpers, The Atlantic Monthly, Scribners* and others of their kind. As *Munsey's* continued to thrive and extend its influence its example was followed here and there. The two or three respectable pioneers grew into scores not so respectable, until today we are drenched and overflooded with this ephemeral literature, and there remains no Ararat of escape from its all pervasive influence.

* * *

WE HAVE IN THESE popular magazines short stories, snappy tales, western dramas, detective plots, adventure serials, and all the scandals of Bohemia served to us monthly and usually oftener. We have books of all shades and hues, which go nicely with the yellow journals of the daily press. We cannot sidestep these masses of printed matter. Few homes are without specimens. Their flaring, daring

cover designs attract perforce even the most modest eye. What shall we say concerning the value of these magazines?

* * *

HAVE THEY ANY educational worth? There are various means of education. The home, the church, the school, books, travel and periodical literature are the chief avenues of educational development. "Education" is a broad term. Its chief functions are those of information, instruction, illumination and inspiration. It may not operate in all these ways, but it must serve one or more of these purposes in order to be reckoned as education at all. The school and the home should serve all of them. We must not expect too much of periodical literature as an educational agent, but we have the right to demand something.

* * *

THE TYPES OF MAGAZINES which we are considering do not educate. They have no vital educational value whatsoever. Their tendency is to superficialize thinking. They contribute to intellectual wastage. Their fiction is frivolous and too often salacious. When they pass beyond fiction they become ridiculous. One may read them hour by hour without receiving a single illuminating idea. They are mental garbage.

* * *

AGAIN, DO THESE magazines assist to form taste or encourage culture? Their style is loose and flamboyant. They rejoice in the use of "newspaper English." They are destitute of ideals, both in management and material. They debauch good taste. Tales of the underworld, lurid incidents, Wild West heroisms, blood and thunder stuff, murder and intrigue, the escapades of frail women, impossible situations, Oriental craftiness and even autobiographies of criminals, are their stock-in-trade. The appeal to the finer feelings, to the nobler nature, to the courage of decency is very rare. They spurn completely "the true, the beautiful and the good."

* * *

DO THESE MAGAZINES contain elements of moral healthfulness? The question has already been partially answered.

They depict the sordid side of moral society. There is practically no challenge to character achievement. They glorify success at every cost. Chiefly, this success consists in the winning of money, the gaining of a girl's love through adventures of a devious moral consistency, or the achievement of some sort of victory over a rival.

* * *

THE STORIES ARE STARTLINGLY deficient in everything that savors of fine moral strength and courage. There are fights without end, usually described in brutal detail, but never a battle of the will against evil. We are not considering any Christian sentiment: everything of this sort is of course absolutely tabu. We are speaking of ordinary manly morality. These magazines do not even represent a pure pagan morality. They are barren of ethical purpose of any sort.

* * *

WE ARE SIMPLY STATING FACTS; we are not suggesting remedies. Indeed, the only remedy we could suggest would be the formation of a sounder moral sense in the body politic. The public are the censors, and they are greedy for the sort of thing these magazines provide. It is a mighty task to develop a cleaner moral ideal and a sounder ethical sense within the heart of a nation.

* * *

WE WHO BELIEVE in better standards and a higher morality can guard our own homes. Our main duty at present lies here. In so far as we have public influence we can let our voices be heard. The religious press, by steady and powerful protest, can accomplish much. Above all the Church of Christ should take a decided stand in denunciation of this insidious and fearful evil.

* * *

ALL THAT WE HAVE SAID of certain magazines may also be said of a multitude of novels which are pouring from the press of our day. But we shall have to wait until another time to utter all that is in our mind concerning many of our present-day novels.

* * *

EDITORIAL NOTES

WE ARE publishing in this issue short articles by three prominent and most efficient Christian laymen, on subjects vital to the plans and work of the churches. They should be carefully read and thoughtfully pondered. The future of the Protestant churches depends not only upon competent ministerial leadership but also on the wise coöperating assistance of the layman. We confess to a hearty belief in the growing progress of lay interest and enterprise in the affairs of the churches. Too many of the laymen of 50 years ago and even 25 years ago were specialists in their critical estimates of ministerial inefficiency, and of weaknesses in denominational life, and quite ready to declare that "if business men instead of ministers were managing the churches things would prosper beyond measure."

* * *

MANY LAY organizations were accordingly formed within a period of ten or fifteen years. Big conventions were held; big speeches were made; but the great expectations were not realized. It was all a rather sad and painful collapse. Since that period lay interests and service have gradually become more intelligent, less boastful, and far more coöperative. Laymen are helping nobly in all directions.

This leads us to consider larger questions and to ask more serious questions. How about the Protestant Church in America? Is it losing its grip? Is it losing heart? Is it losing ground? Is it a spent force? These are surely searching and vital questions. Let us seek an answer by a brief study of various aspects of the Church's work.

* * *

IN ITS LOCAL enterprises the church seems to be prospering. The individual church is a much larger and more important affair than it was one hundred years ago, or even fifty. New opportunities for effective work have constantly been presented, and have been eagerly met and vigorously entered upon. All manner of helpful organizations have been formed, and these are continually increasing in numbers and influence.

THE ACTIVITIES of almost any church that may be named are about threefold as great today as they were a generation or two ago. Duties and responsibilities undreamed of then are now accepted as legitimate and necessary forms of Christly service. Two sermons and a prayer meeting no longer constitute a church program, or if here and there they still do, extreme spiritual poverty and religious bankruptcy are the result.

* * *

THIS WIDENING of the work of the church has involved large expense, and here also the condition of things is satisfactory. The amounts invested in new church edifices, in the renovating of old buildings which have been brought up to date, in the extension of church plans through the addition of parish houses and Sunday school buildings, in maintainance and enlargement of church equipment, and in the employment of additional workers to carry forward the new phases of consecration, reach a startling total each year. Millions of dollars, and yet more millions, are being constantly poured into these new enterprises, which are of such great value and possess such elements of permanent worth.

* * *

IN THE MATTER of membership also there is reason for joy. The membership of Protestant churches in every part of the country is greater than it has ever been. But more than this! It is greater in proportion to the population than it has ever been before. The church growth is much more rapid than the population growth. In other words, the forces that are spiritual and Christ-centered are steadily gaining upon the forces that are secular and self-centered.

* * *

IT MAY BE SAID that this large church membership showing is due to the laxity of the churches in failing to erase the names of useless people. This is true in part, but it was also true in the past, so the proportionate increase still holds good. Besides this, very many churches have been doing their duty in recent years and have eliminated or else swung into line the non-active element.

IN ADDITION to all this, let the fact be clearly held in mind that a larger proportion of members are engaged in active service than was the case in the past. "Going to meeting" or not going was then the chief test, and about the only one, of activity or indifference. Today there are so many avenues of service, so many ministries of usefulness in an average church, that a host of people are busy where before there were only a few.

* * *

THE MATTER of ministerial leadership, both intellectual and administrative, is less encouraging than we could wish. Many complaints concerning the lack of first-class candidates for the ministry have been made in recent years. The confusions of the war period, and the reaction of post-war conditions diminished the number of such candidates temporarily, but recently published statistics show that within the evangelical denominations there is a large increase from earlier periods, in the number of such candidates.

* * *

BUT WE MUST FACE a still more serious situation. A professor in a large Western theological school made the statement in our hearing a few years ago: "There is not a single first-class man among our one hundred students." He was referring to intellectual ability, and he no doubt exaggerated. At a conference of men from a dozen colleges and seminaries of the Middle West, held at Northwestern University, a discussion of the question, "Why are so few gifted men entering the Christian ministry?" elicited no argument whatever about the fact itself. It was conceded by all present that the ablest young men were no longer entering the ministry in large numbers. The discussion occupied itself entirely with the reasons for the acknowledged fact. It is a fact that must be faced candidly.

* * *

LET THERE be no misunderstanding. The rising ministry is a fine and able body of men. There is probably no more noble, devoted and sacrificing group of people in America

today than that which constitutes the active Protestant ministry. They are morally clean, consecrated to the highest purposes, and zealous in the business of the kingdom.

* * *

NEVERTHELESS, the problem of trained and cultured leaders, far-seeing and statesmanlike, is a serious one. With some fine exceptions—there are exceptions to every rule—the men entering the ministry during the last twenty years seem to have been not quite the equal of those of prior periods, in sheer intellectual force, and capacity for large constructive leadership. It is just here that the church is weakest.

* * *

IN THE MATTER of world-wide evangelization, as in that of local effort, the church has been constantly reaching new heights of achievement. One hundred and fifty years ago the Protestant churches were confined chiefly to a portion of Northern Europe and scattered settlements in the New World. Their growth since then, and up to the present moment, is the most amazing fact in the history of Christianity. The churches are everywhere in America, and their outposts are everywhere else. The world is honeycombed by their influence. Their missions are centers of radiant energy in all lands, although financial difficulties and depressions have made certain temporary curtailments necessary within the last few years.

* * *

HAS THE CHURCH remained true to evangelical and spiritual principles? Yes, the heart of the church is faithful to the truth. The overwhelming majority of the good people of the American churches are loyal to the sovereign and soul-saving teachings of Jesus Christ our Lord. That there are defections and apostasies must be acknowledged, even when we agree that spiritual life takes many forms and shapes and shades and hues. Nobody is like anybody else, nor can be. There is an infinite variety of religious experiences. In recent years there has been a rather astonishing

return to conservative positions and to a renewed evangelical zeal.

* * *

THERE IS ALSO an amazing similarity as God's people approach the Cross. Here the many differences merge in the divine unities. The heart of the church is sound. The men and women of the churches believe in Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, who came with power to forgive sins and bring us back to God.

* * *

WE HAVE SOUGHT to analyze the situation dispassionately and to state the facts frankly. We believe that the church as a whole has never been so strong, so active, so well-equipped, so true to the faith of the Redeemer, as it is today. Let us pray that mighty leaders may be given to this waiting and willing and expectant church, to guide it forward to still greater victories in this new and glorious age.

The Virgin Birth of the Messiah

By Rev. Jacob Gartenhaus, Th.M.

THE predictions of the coming of a Messiah run through the entire Old Testament. They appear at first as faint streaks of light in the prophetic sky, but the light gradually brightens until the whole face of the East reflects the dazzling splendor of the rising sun. The Supreme Being to Whom is known the end from the beginning, through His servants, the prophets, foretold a vast number of events concerning the coming Messiah which were fulfilled at the exact time and in the exact manner predicted. So numerous are these predictions that one need not rely upon any single revelation in order to identify Him as He appeared on the scene in later years.

However, in this brief study, we are limiting ourselves to the consideration of one question only—that of His virgin birth, especially as foretold in Messianic prophecy.

It has been argued by some that the virgin birth is not compatible with the laws of nature, or even common sense. As if man knows what the "laws of nature" are; as if giving birth in the natural way is not an inexplicable miracle; as if life in whatever form, whether it be a blade of grass, a microbe or man himself is not one great mystery which no one can elucidate or science explain.

The love of God "passeth all understanding," even our common sense. Take away the miraculous and the divine of the Bible and you have an ordinary book not worth bothering about or taking as a subject for serious lectures and the like.

Times without number it has been argued to the effect that "science has disproved the doctrine of special creation," or that "no scientist believes in a personal God." It is inferred that science denies the existence of anything beyond what we call "natural law." Science has proved no such thing.

"I have never known a thinking man who did not believe in God," says Dr. Robert Andrews Millikan, the distinguished American physicist who was awarded a Nobel prize for his revolutionary discoveries in electricity. "I cannot explain why I am alive rather than dead," he continues. "Physiologists can tell me a great deal about the mechanical and chemical processes of my body, but they cannot say why I am alive. But would it not be utterly absurd for me to deny I am alive? Our scientific knowledge compared with what we knew a hundred years ago is very great, but compared with what there is to be known it is trivial." [1]

"Dismiss the idea that natural law may swallow up religion," says Doctor Eddington, professor of astronomy at Cambridge University, England, and one of the world's foremost scientists. "It cannot even tackle the multiplication table single-handed." [2]

William Thomson, Lord Kelvin, professor of natural philosophy at the University of Glasgow for fifty-three years and an outstanding scientist of the last century, says: "Science positively affirms creative power. It is not in dead matter that we live and move and have our being, but in the creating and directing power which science compels us to accept as an article of belief. We are absolutely forced by science to believe in an influence other than physical or dynamical or electrical forces. . . .

"Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers that we saw grew by mere chemical forces. He answered 'No, no more than I could believe a book on botany, describing them, could grow by mere chemical forces.' Every action of free will is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science. Do not be afraid to be free thinkers. If you think strongly enough, you will be forced by science to believe in God." [3]

I have quoted from three of the foremost scientists of the

1. From an interview by Samuel Crowther in *Collier's National Weekly*, Oct. 25, 1925.
2. From his Swarthmore lecture at a meeting of the London Quakers on May 22, 1929.
3. From his Chancellor's Address in April, 1903.

world to prove that they acknowledged a supernatural power. How foolish, then, of us "pigmy" men on a giant earth—itself lost in the universe—to have no faith in God who made all things!

Any Jew who sincerely believes in the miracles of his own Old Testament should not find it difficult to believe in the miracle of the virgin birth. If God could create Adam out of the dust of the earth, and Eve out of a rib, why could not the same omnipotent God, who is not bound by any iron rule, make possible the virgin birth?

We are told that when God appeared to Abraham and made the promise of a son, Abraham laughed and said in his heart: "Shall a child be born unto him that is a hundred years old, and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?" (Genesis 17: 17). And Sarah likewise laughed within herself—a laughter of doubt and mistrust. Looking at it from a human viewpoint they had reason to laugh. "I am waxed old," said Sarah, "and past child bearing in this course of nature, especially being hitherto barren and my lord is old also" (Genesis 18: 10-14). The Lord asked: "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" Is anything so difficult as to exceed His power? Yes, the birth of Isaac was perhaps as much contrary to the laws of nature as that of the Messiah Jesus.

Let us now briefly examine from a critical viewpoint Isaiah's prophecy of the virgin birth.

In the fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter of Isaiah we read that "a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." The context shows the occasion of the message. The entire chapter contains twenty-five verses and easily divides itself into three parts: the first part, verses 1-12, is mostly historical, giving a sketch of the times of King Ahaz who was then on the throne of David, and who was one of the worst characters the Bible records. But in the interest of God's purpose He did not allow the wicked plan of Pecah and Rezin, who wanted to destroy the House of David, to be carried out, and for this reason God sent Isaiah with his son, Shear-Yashub, which

means "the remnant will return," to Ahaz to console him and give him new courage and promised that his enemies would not be successful. But wicked Ahaz would not accept the challenge the prophet gave to "ask thee a sign," whereupon the prophet turned away from him and addressed himself to the people.

Notwithstanding their own faithlessness, God pledges them a sign of the permanency of the throne of David which is contained in verses 13-16, the second part of the chapter.

The third part of the chapter, verses 17-25, contain prophetic predictions of calamity to befall Judah at the hands of the king of Assyria who came to assist Ahaz against the devices of Pekah, the king of Israel.

But what interests us is contained in the fourteenth verse: "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

There are three different interpretations of this passage: first, that it refers wholly to the time of Ahaz; second, that it is a prophecy of the Messiah; third, that it has a double application—to an event in the prophet's own time, and to the birth of the Messiah.

It would take us far afield to discuss all the theories that have been propounded by those who would deny its Messianic import. It has been argued that it is a reference to Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, but the best Christian and Jewish authorities, among them such men as R. David Kimchi,[4] hold that Hezekiah was born nine years before and was far from being a prince of peace. Another theory is that it was Isaiah's own wife; but as we shall see the word "almah," "virgin," could not with propriety be applied to a married woman who was the mother of Shear-Yashub.

Besides, the name Immanuel, "God with us," by which the child was to be called, is too sacred and significant to find a satisfactory fulfillment in any local event of that time. The thoughtful student of God's Word is acquainted with the twofold nature of prophecy, the means by which there

4. Of the 12th Century and who still exerts a great influence upon the Jews.

were frequently partial fulfillments of the prophecy before the complete fulfillments took place. The celebrated Pascal observes that the prophets intermingle national prophecies with those concerning the Messiah in order that these latter might not be without proof, nor the former without advantage.

These remarks may be exemplified in that memorial prediction contained in the seventh chapter of Isaiah. All attempts to identify this virgin with any person living in the prophet's time have utterly failed. On the contrary, we find that the ancient Jewish authorities applied this to the Messiah. If a young woman conceived in the ordinary course of nature and bore a son how could such a commonplace event be a sign from God? This prophecy should be considered in connection with the further and fuller reference to this child of promise in chapters nine and eleven. For example, in the sixth verse of the ninth chapter we observe: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace," titles which cannot be applied to any other than the Immanuel born of a virgin.

Now let us examine the word "almah," which is here used for "virgin." It has been argued that if it had been intended to convey the strict meaning of virginity, the word "bethulah" would have been used and not "almah," which might be applied to a young married woman. But in Joel 1:8, "bethulah" is evidently used for a young married woman. The fact in the case is that "bethulah" does not stand so definitely for a pure virgin as "almah," which is the term used by the prophet. The English interpreters of the Bible, some argue, did not know enough Hebrew. But they overlook the fact that Matthew, who applied the text to the exceptional birth of the Messiah, was not an Englishman of King James' time but a Hebrew of the first century who knew his Hebrew better than they and would not have used the text describing the virgin birth if the word "almah"

did not mean "virgin." Matthew quotes this prophecy from the Septuagint, the oldest translation of the Bible in existence, dating back some twenty-two hundred years, and the Greek word used for "virgin" in Matthew in the Septuagint is "parthenos," which never means a young married woman but always a "maiden" or "virgin" as our word goes.

A careful study of the word "almah" in the six other passages in which it occurs reveals that it has reference to a young married woman.

1. The first of these is in Genesis 24: 35, where we have the record of Abraham sending his servant, Eliezer, to secure a wife for his son Isaac. He proceeds on his journey until he meets Rebekah to whom he refers in verse sixteen as a "bethulah"; while in verse forty-three she is called an "almah." In the first case there is a general description of her, while in the second case she is described in the light of what Eliezar was seeking—a young, unmarried woman, a virgin.

2. In Exodus 2: 8 the young unmarried sister of Moses, Miriam, is called an "almah," leaving no doubt that she was a virgin.

3. In Psalm 68: 25 we read: "The singers went before, the players on instruments followed after; among them were the damsels playing with timbrels." The word for "damsels" here is "alamoth," the plural of "almah." Young women or female youth, and married women are not classified with youth.

4. In Proverbs 30: 18-19 we read: "There are three things which are too wonderful for me, yea, four which I know not: The way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent upon a rock; the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and the way of a man with a maid." The word here used for "maid" is "almah," and it must indeed be a young woman in her virginity, for if it were a married woman the author of Proverbs need not have wondered any more.

5. In Song of Solomon 1: 3 we read: "Because of the savour of thy good ointment thy name is as ointment poured forth, therefore do the virgins love thee." Here again the

word used is "alamoth," virgins. Young married women are not supposed to indulge in such youthful love. The plurality of the word here used forbids the meaning of married women. If not it would make the beloved an adulterer and the "alamoth" adulteresses, in which such case a song could not have found a place in the canon of the Old Testament.

6. In The Song of Solomon 6: 8 we read: "There are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and virgins without number." Here we have three distinct kinds of females: queens who were the favorite wives; concubines, common law wives; and virgins, unmarried women. Had these latter already been married they would have been included in the other two groups.

For a clearer understanding of this prophecy we must go back to Genesis 3: 15: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Here we have the same truth set forth. Already in the Garden of Eden, as soon as sin entered into the world and man lost fellowship with God, God in His infinite compassion announced the coming of "the seed of the woman" who would bruise the serpent's head, destroy the devil and his works, and through which man could be brought back to Him. This promise was from the first understood, that some personal deliverer would rescue fallen man from the thraldom of the yoke of evil. It is absurd to suppose that these words of blame, inflicting punishment upon the serpent, were addressed to an irrational animal and not to an intelligent, accountable being. During all the long ages when man was falling more and more deeply and hopelessly under the power of evil, this promise was the hope and stay of every devout and God-fearing soul.

Richard Chenevix Trench has well said: "No thoughtful student of the past records of mankind can refuse to acknowledge that through all its history there has run the hope of redemption from the evil which oppresses it; nor of this only but that this hope has continually linked itself

on to some single man. The help that is coming to the world, it has ever seen incorporated in a person."

Professor C. A. Briggs says: "Herein is the germ of promise which unfolds in the history of redemption. Out of the despair of the first fall, in the experience of the first sin and shame, sorrow and pain, the heart of man rebounds with hope into the future, which was opened by the divine prediction. We have then, a blessing to the human race involved in this curse of the serpent; a promise of redemption to be accomplished, not by the woman, but by her seed." [5]

The chief significance of this prophecy lies with the woman instead of the man. It is well to observe the exactness of the expression, "Her seed." Nowhere in the Bible do we find the expression, "seed of the woman," except in this place. This is a departure from the universal Scriptural as well as ordinary usage, that every merely human child is the "seed of the man."

Unprejudiced rabbinical literature admitted that the "seed of the woman," as well as Isaiah 7: 14, had reference to the Messiah. Commenting on Genesis 3: 15, The Jerusalem Targum says: "And I will put enmity between thee and the *woman,* and between the seed of thy sons, and between the *seed* of her sons; and it shall be when the sons of the *woman* keep the commandments of the law: They will be prepared to smite thee on thy head; but if they forsake the commandments of the law, thou wilt be prepared to wound them in the heel. Nevertheless for them shall be a medicine; and they shall make a remedy for the heel in the days of the King Messiah."

Targum Onkelos says: "And I will put enmity between thee and between the *woman,* and between thy son and her son. He will remember thee and what thou didst to *Him* from (at) the beginning, and thou shalt be observant unto *Him* at the end."

R. David Kimchi says: "As thou wentest forth for the *salvation of thy people* by the hands of the *Messiah,* the *Son of David,* who shall wound Satan who is the head, the

5. *Messianic Prophecy,* pp. 73, 75.

king and *Prince* of the house of the wicked, and shall raze up all his strength, power, policy and dominion."

In Peshikita Rab. 3:6 [6] we read as follows: "As the incarnation of evil Satan is the arch-enemy of the *Messiah;* He is the anti-Christ. The light which was created before the world was hidden by God beneath his throne; and to the question of *Satan* in regard to it God answered: 'This light is kept for *Him* who shall bring thee to shame.' At his request God showed *Satan* the *Messiah:* and when he saw *Him,* he trembled, fell upon his face, and cried: 'Verily, this is the Messiah, who shall hurl (bruise) me, and all the princes of the *Angels* of the peoples down even unto hell."

Commenting on Isaiah 7:14, Jarchi says: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive." There are some who say that this was made a sign because a virgin "fuit non apta generationi."

Also Maimonides (More Nevochim) on this same passage says: "This is one of the passages in the Scripture which is most wonderful, and not to be understood according to the letter, but contains great wisdom in it." What difference is there, it has been asked, in what manner Jesus was born? What has that to do with Christianity?

It has a great deal to do with it, for if Jesus was not born of a virgin, as the Scriptures teach, then He was born out of wedlock and was therefore an illegitimate child, or, as the Bible speaks of it, a bastard; and as such He had no right to enter the Holy Temple. We read in Deuteronomy 23:2: "A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the Lord." There are several instances in the Bible of children born out of wedlock; for example Ishmael, Abraham's son. He was a bastard, although conceived through Abraham, and in blessing Abraham the Lord ignored Ishmael, telling the former distinctly that such blessings would not come through Ishmael but through Isaac, his legitimate child.

6. Ed. Friedman, p. 16, b.

Another instance is found in Genesis 19: 36-38, where we find that the daughters of Lot were with child by their own father—out of wedlock. Their descendants were the Moabites and Ammonites and were never allowed to enter the congregation of the Lord. In Deuteronomy 23: 3 we read: "An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the Lord forever." Another case is that of Jephthah, in Judges 11: 1-2, who was sent out of the House of Israel because he had no legal mother—she was a prostitute.

We prefer to accept the interpretations of the first Christians who were Jews and possessed a better knowledge of the Scriptures than modern critics, and they linked the prophecy of the virgin birth with Christ.

As we read: "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: and knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name Jesus" (Matthew 1: 18-25).

Similarly we read: "And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was

Joseph, of the House of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed are thou among women. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call his name *Jesus"* (Luke 1:26-31).

We note also the testimony of the angel to the shepherds: "And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord" (Luke 2: 10-11).

The virgin birth is in complete harmony with what we know of the life of Jesus. One cannot imagine the Son of God born in the ordinary way. He whose life, death and resurrection were all miraculous, His birth also must needs have been miraculous.

If you are a bewildered "modern," caught in the cruel trap of your own skepticism, saying: "I will not believe anything but what I understand," I would ask you to explain the simple, everyday occurrence of how eating the same grass makes feathers on the backs of geese, bristles on the backs of swine, wool on sheep and hair on cows?

We have not tried in any sense to be exhaustive in our treatment of this great subject. Many phases of it we have perhaps left untouched, but we hope that we have somehow in these pages made it plain that this doctrine is not repugnant nor strange to the teachings of the Old Testament, or the Omnipotent God.

All those who have come to really know the Saviour feel that something was born in them too; something marvelous, something that passeth all understanding.

Beyond Fundamentalism

By Prof. William A. Mueller, Ph.D.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK a year and a half ago preached a sermon entitled *"Beyond Modernism."* In this sermon the eminent minister of the Riverside Church has confessed in the frankest manner the besetting sins of modernism. Fosdick suggested at the time that "fundamentalists had better talk as openly to themselves" as he has done to his modernist brethren. As far as I know no outstanding fundamentalist has answered that challenge thus far. Hence, a humble disciple of the Master ventures forth to speak his mind on a matter of grave concern to himself, and, I trust, also to a host of friends throughout this land.

Fundamentalism had, historically speaking, a right to exist, since it defended those essential Christian truths which modernism was all too prone to surrender before the Baal of modern culture. Fundamentalism, however, has often grievously sinned *in the manner and spirit* in which it conducted the defense of sound gospel truth. As I see it, fundamentalism is guilty of having committed four sins during its eventful history. Of these it surely must repent before God and men if it is to enter into a deeper and more fruitful Christian faith and life.

Firstly, fundamentalism has often been *excentric* in its presentation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Do I hear a cry of bitter protest? Will some of my brethren say: "Of all charges against us, this is the most absurd. *We* have preached the gospel. *We* have declared the whole counsel of God"? But are you so sure? May I recall some things to your attention? For instance, are you ever pricked in your hearts over the dangerous spirit of divisiveness in fundamentalist circles? What of the internecine strife in the newly founded, one-year-old Presbyterian Church? Or the Haldemann-Mauro controversy? Or what is much worse, the Ku Klux Klan mentality which compounds so deftly supposedly Christian virtues with a bizarre type of

American patriotism? What of the unscriptural and hasty identification of living personalities like the former Kaiser, Mussolini and Hitler with antichrist? What of the numerous cranks which a sectarian and unbalanced type of fundamentalist ministry has produced? These, and other aberrations are to be credited to an excentric, off-balance presentation of gospel truth.

Dr. Earle V. Pierce, President of the Northern Baptist Convention, said in his baccalaureate sermon at The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary: "Multitudes in our churches have been deceived by a selfish evangelism. Jesus Christ has been offered to them as Saviour from sin, but not as Lord. The result has been a self-centered sort of Christian who denies with his life what he confesses with his mouth." And rightly did Dr. Pierce declare: "What we need to emphasize afresh in our preaching is the *sovereign Lordship of Jesus Christ.* Proclaim the gospel truth in the Scriptural order like Peter who said on Pentecost: "God hath made the same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ."

Is not an excentric interpretation of the gospel responsible for the fact that Christians are breaking fellowship because they disagree on the mode of the coming of Christ's kingdom? Personally I gladly and unreservedly affirm my faith in Christ's parousia as the consummation of the work He began in his incarnation and on Calvary's cross. May modernists laugh my faith to scorn—I am in good company, —Spurgeon, prince of preachers, had this blessed hope, and Karl Heim, a theologian of great learning, ably defends it today,—but does this my faith in Christ's advent in glory imply that I must preach this doctrine at the expense of all other Christian truth as some are doing? It is quite possible to mediate the truth of the Lord's second coming in such an intellectualistic manner as to make this truth utterly unfruitful and paralyze real spiritual growth. I affirm that whoever claims Christ as Lord, no matter in what camp he worships and what his specific interpretation of the mode of his kingdom's coming may be, is my brother beloved. And

I will work with him till the dawn of dawns, when sin shall be no more, and death will be swallowed up in victory.

Secondly, fundamentalism's devotees have very frequently been *distastefully prejudicial and unfair* both to themselves and to their opponents. Anyone familiar with the facts will understand this remark. Fundamentalists have been sadly adept in the art of hurling charges at anybody who in the least *seemed* to differ from their expressed shibboleths. When a theologian of our acquaintance was appointed professor in the school he is now serving, immediately some alumni expressed their grave misgivings as to his conservatism. And why? Simply because mention had been made of his having studied at a seminary where liberalism was prevalent. I ask in all sincerity: Is that fair and Christian? Is it right so to classify Christian ministers? We do not label a public schoolteacher a behaviorist just because he studied under Watson at Columbia. Nor do we call a Baptist a Roman Catholic because he happened to study at a Jesuit college. Let us be fair and square to one another, but particularly to those who differ from us. Christian decency demands it!

If a liberal writes a fine book we need not sneer at it. If a city like socialist-controlled Milwaukee achieves the distinction of being one of the best governed municipalities of America we need not minimize the significance of that fact just because we are conservatives. Parenthetically speaking, liberals and modernists are just as guilty in this respect as fundamentalists.

When we came last year in our church history class upon the work of Walter Rauschenbusch I asked: "How many of you have read any of his works?" A few affirmed acquaintance with his writings. I then felt constrained to say: "But some of you will decry Rauschenbusch's work as soon as you get a chance, although you have not read a single line of his. Would that at all be fair?" At times I have stated my strong divergence from Rauschenbusch's theology, but that does not in the least preclude my honest admiration for a man who had deep convictions. Nor do I

fail to mention when opportunity offers itself that the mystical prophet of social righteousness hammered out his ideas on the anvil of experience, when for eleven years he labored in Hell's Kitchen on New York City's West Side for a pittance of $1,000.00 per year before he went to Rochester Seminary. This is an achievement which many a social gospeller of our day is unable to accomplish, I fear. And I often add, it was Rauschenbusch who with great skill and devotion translated the Sankey-Moody gospel hymns into the German language, and Christians in my native land have been singing these American songs during the past thirty or thirty-five years. Such an interpretation I call fair and in accord with the mind of Christ. But this tendency so apparent amongst us to twist and caricature our opponents is abominable. We ought to repent of it, and do it speedily, for in some of this business there is poison and murder that kills precious souls.

Does such an attitude imply that I think lightly of heresy? Not in the least! Real heresy, to be sure, is a dangerous, deadly, and intolerable sin. I cannot agree with those who under the cloak of academic freedom defend the right to teach anything and everything in the Christian church or in a Christian school. As Christian ministers and teachers we are under divine orders. Rightly did Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert recently say: "We cannot be content of thinking of the church as a religious association whose character is whatever its members make it. Such a view overlooks the central fact that the church is the *church of Christ,* and not merely of men." We cannot, when vital issues of Christian faith are at stake—and when are they not?—say both *Yes* and *No* in one breath. A carnal, undisciplined interpretation of Christian liberty has, alas, turned the church into a paganized discussion forum. We must by all means pray for the courage of God-born convictions. But I am pleading for this: before the charge of heresy is made let us have less argument, and more prayer; less self-assertive denunciation, and more exhortation and preaching like Paul's, a preaching that was done "with fear and trembling," under

the impelling passion which cried out: "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." And finally, may I remind our 150% fundamentalist brethren that Dwight L. Moody possessed grace enough to coöperate most lovingly and effectively with Professor Henry Drummond, ardent soul winner and evolutionist! If the great evangelist was able to do that will it not be possible for you and me to work with brethren whose minds are cast in a different mold from ours, but who do believe wholeheartedly in Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour?

Thirdly, fundamentalism has often been *extremely shallow* in its methods and techniques. This criticism is not intended as a defense of ritualism. God has all sorts of ways to woo the wayward sinner back to his fatherly heart. But I have often been startled by the amazing number of stunt preachers which particularly fundamentalist churches have produced. However, this might still be born as the inevitable consequence of democratic procedures. But what are we to think of evangelists who advertise themselves by proudly enumerating the number of converts won under their preaching? What does God think of the competitive methods of luring people away from other churches? One large city church tried to induce five members of one family who had been visiting that church to transfer their membership although they had protested severely against it. Perhaps liberals are equally guilty in this matter. But is the budget more important than a sensitive, Spirit-guided conscience? Is Christ on the throne, or the dollar? I for one have seen too much of this type of soul winning in fundamentalist circles to feel easy about it. We had better repent before the Lord and be done with cheap and unspiritual techniques. Otherwise we need not wonder if even the robust worldlings will despise us.

Fourthly, fundamentalism is guilty of identifying the woe and weal of the Christian church with the *preservation of the present economic and political order.* If liberals and modernists have been dangerously enslaved by the *Zeitgeist,* that is, by a given culture, fundamentalists, I fear, have

been dangerously enslaved by the *Geldgeist,* that is, by a given social system.

Only yesterday leading fundamentalists have said: Whatever happens in the world outside concerns us little. We are pilgrims, and our citizenship is in heaven. Let us quietly preach the gospel until He comes. I would be the last to beiittle this message. I have preached it myself, and this otherworldliness, if it be but genuine and sincere in word and deed, is not to be despised. Whenever death breaks ruthlessly into my life I realize that indeed our labors here are beset with anxiety, sorrow, and failure. And unless sin and death be done away all our endeavors for social change and reform will have but relative and demonstrative significance. It will ever be the duty of the Christian ministry to focus men's attention upon the eternal, for the world of today is utterly *diesseitig,* carnally minded. And yet, has not the German church struggle demonstrated most conclusively that Christians cannot possibly live bifurcated lives? Ultimately, there is not one realm of human life that does not come within the scope of Christian life and thought. Our Christian brethren in Germany have come to realize that it is no longer possible to make nice academic distinctions between the secular and the religious. For in Nazi Germany we have the clash between two totality claims. On the one hand there is the omnipotent state which would lay hold of man's body, mind and soul in ruthless completeness, on the other hand there is the claim of the Lord of heaven and earth who demands absolute obedience from his children, and who says: *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods beside me.* The era when Christians thought they could cultivate the "inner life" in private seclusion à la Schleiermacher is definitely gone. And fundamentalists had better wake up to that fact. Some are indeed waking up, but alas, in the wrong way. It is that branch of fundamentalism which is identified with such movements as are represented by the "National Conference of Christian Ministers and Laymen" assembled in the summer of 1936 in Asheville, North Carolina. These people do recognize their

share of responsibility toward politics and economics. Their avowed aim is to "uphold the Christian religion, stimulate Americanism, and fight the Saviour's shameless foe—Communism." They predicate the continuance of the Church of Jesus Christ upon the preservation of the present social order. They would overlook the terrible social sins of our day and age, and subordinate the church to economics. They also identify everyone who is in the least perturbed about the grave social issues that confront us today as a radical and a communist. What are we to think of this kind of militant fundamentalism?

I for one could never identify myself with this type of fundamentalistic mentality. Anyone who predicates the continuance of the Church of the living God upon the preservation of any social and political system does not know what the church is. Said Karl Barth in 1935:

> "The gospel does not live because Christianity is favored by the general development or because it has the approval of leading politicians, of the cultured, of youth or even of the masses. And thus the gospel cannot suffer when Christianity is actually conventionalized in London or if it is overlooked in Zurich, adulterated in Berlin and persecuted in Petersburg. The gospel goes freely through all these possibilities. The momentary situation is Christianity's sphere, but never its condition, either in good or evil."

If communism is to be dealt with it must be done on the plane of spiritual warfare as Paul conceives the Christian's life in the sixth chapter of Ephesians. But it is utterly unchristian if the friends of the gospel appeal to fascist ideologies in order to safeguard the church of God.

The writer does not share the optimism of liberals that through our activities in the social sphere the kingdom of God is being established. Nevertheless I want to coöperate with all honest men and women whose hearts are deeply disturbed over the wrongs of society. We dare not remain indifferent when our blessed Lord took our plight so seriously as to go to the cross there to atone for our sins

by which we have slain bodies, enchained minds, and shackled souls and robbed God of His glory.

Dr. Norris of Detroit said some time ago in answer to his critics: "Wherever Paul preached there was either a riot or a revival." I heartily agree with this statement. Was Paul therefore an anarchist? Did he throw bombs or start conspiracies against established authority? He did not. And yet, wherever Paul went he clashed with religious, ecclesiastical, philosophical and political authorities. The dynamite of the gospel of a crucified and risen Lord who will some day judge the world in righteousness produced this revolutionary effect. Paul and the early Christians knew that the secular and religious cannot be separated in Christian thinking. For Christ lays all of life under his control. Paul's message, proclaimed in the power of the Holy Spirit, aroused the fierce anger of the moralists, offended the pride and conceit of the intellectuals, and touched the pocketbooks of the pagan silversmiths of Ephesus and of the cattle raisers of Bythinia. No wonder his enemies cried out: "They that turn the world upside down have also come hither!" Many of us yearn for a spiritual revival of evangelical faith and life. Well we may! But I fear that some of us pray for a revival in the manner of a Christian business man of whom I have heard. A friend of mine who visited him noticed how he was concerned about a revival. Upon inquiry my friend discovered that this respectable Christian layman was praying for a revival so that his laborers might be more content and his wealth be safeguarded in a possible social upheaval. If that is the motive behind our prayer for revival we stand condemned before the living God. Then we literally prescribe how God should work out his larger purposes with mankind. Then we do not pray in all sincerity: "THY will be done on earth as it is done in heaven." But why say more? Let everybody, guided by God's Spirit, draw his own conclusions.

Fosdick in his sermon, *"Beyond Modernism,"* has defended the thesis that the church had to go as far as modern-

ism in order to be able to go beyond it. I have my grave doubts about the validity of this assumption. If, as Fosdick himself admits, modernism left people worshipping before the altar of an unknown God, although He had appeared who said, "I am the Light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life," then modernism was not a necessary phase of Christian thought, but a spiritual malady, a grievous sin against Christ, our Lord and Saviour.

I for one cannot be a modernist. As one who attended the German Gymnasium prior to and during the World War I have known modernism at its best and at its worst. Most of us, after imbibing for nine years between the ages of 10-19 the religious and philosophical instruction of our modernist professors left for the university not as worshippers of the Lord Jesus, but as the worshippers of Goethe, or Haeckel, or Nietzsche, or even Buddha. May I remind Dr. Fosdick of Alfred Rosenberg? A man of no mean cultural attainments whom Adolf Hitler has entrusted with the task of inculcating Nazi philosophy into the minds and souls of German youth, the entire Nazi party and the German people! Men like Fosdick speak out in vehement protest against Nazi persecution of Jews and Christians. I join in this protest unreservedly! But does Fosdick realize that Rosenberg, the determined foe of Christianity, takes his weapons for the destruction of all Christian faith and culture from the arsenal of liberal and modernistic theological thinkers? Rosenberg tries to twist Jesus Christ into a Nordic just as modernists of yesterday made him out to be a Kantian philosopher, or a Jewish apocalyptic dreamer, a deluded socialist, or a modern rotarian. Rosenberg's vindictive hatred against the apostle Paul and against the Jews goes back to the destructive criticism of modernists of the last hundred years. A defender of the New Germany recently interpreted to American readers the fact that Rosenberg is nothing but an "evangelical modernist." And well he might so interpret the author of the "Mythos of the 20th Century." It all began with men like Kant and Hegel who

preached the autonomy of human reason, with men like Goethe and Nietzsche who preached the innate divinity of man. The deification of the Nordic man is but the logical result of modernism. Rosenberg has simply gone a little further: he, too, is a "Beyond Modernist."

Fosdick ended his sermon by saying that the "future of the churches, if we will have it so, is in the hands of modernism. Therefore, let all modernists lift the new battle cry: We must go beyond modernism." If the readers expect me to end with a similar refrain in favor of fundamentalism I must disillusion them. To be sure, fundamentalism must go beyond and press toward a position that is truly Christocentric. But I dare not entrust the fate of the Christian Church either to the modernists or to the fundamentalists. Whenever *we* foolish humans seek to control the course of God's purpose in the world by means of our shibboleths we generally make a mess of things. I would rather, like Paul of old, commit the church to *Him* who is able to keep that which is committed unto *Him*. Let us return unto the Lord whom we have denied so long, we conservatives with our pharisaic complacency, you modernists with your sadducaic unbelief. Let us with contrite hearts and in humble faith own *Him* as Lords of lords, and *King* of kings, and the closer we shall come to *Him,* our eternal Christ, the better we shall love each other and the more effectively shall we be able to work together in His vineyard.

A Young Baptist Internationale

By Dr. T. G. Dunning, M.A., London

GRADUALLY and quietly a Movement is growing which already almost girdles the Globe and brings into a spiritual unity young people racially and politically poles asunder. Our far-flung, detached young Baptist organizations are being drawn into a strong ecumenical Movement. No international boundaries, barriers of speech or political differences appear to retard the growth of the Christian collective thought and corporate action that characterize this Movement which is being promoted by the Youth Committee of the Baptist World Alliance.

An International Young Baptist Committee was formed at the Stockholm Congress in 1923, and at Toronto in 1928 this was reconstituted, and became the Youth Committee of the Baptist World Alliance.

Its first international Congress was held at Prague in August, 1931, when 400 young Baptists were present from 16 different nations. This gave the impulse and example for many similar meetings. The Scandinavian young Baptists formed themselves into a Union and occasionaly met in rallies. In August, 1934, thirty leaders of Youth representing 15 countries met for conference at Woltersdorf near Berlin. At the quadrennial Congress of Baptist students in the Southern States of America held in the same year, there were present representatives from South America, Germany, Great Britain, and other countries. At present an interstate tour and conference is being planned by young Baptists in Australia. The formation of a Union of our young people in some of the countries in the Southeast of Europe is also contemplated.

This international service increases in diversity as well as range. Pen-friendships are formed between different countries. Already 550 young people in Britain are engaged in this service. So by correspondence young people pool their

thoughts and spiritual experiences with those of other nations. Youth leaders in one land contribute articles for the young Baptist periodicals of another land. Literature is exchanged. Fellowship tours are planned for young people to various countries. The visitors are usually entertained in the homes of young Baptists who also make arrangements for sightseeing and conference. Help is offered to young people when visiting lands other than their own for purposes of study or commerce.

Our young Baptists are showing a great readiness and enthusiasm for international understanding and friendship and no labor or inconvenience is too great for them if it will bring them into happy and effective contact with their brothers and sisters of other lands. In August, 1931, the 120 young British Baptists who were going to the Prague Congress, were invited for four days to stay in the homes of young people in Berlin. So keen were the young German Baptists to share in this fellowship, that some slept on the floor for four nights in order that their beds might be given to the visiting young British Baptists. This willingness to serve in such international contact is making possible a great expansion of the work of the Youth Committee of the Baptist World Alliance.

In these and many other activities the members of the Youth Committee have rendered yeoman service. They have shown a rare ability for organization and great devotion to the cause of Christian international peace. Although representing in some cases, countries that are violently opposed politically, they have developed a wonderful unity of thought and purpose.

In circumstances such as these we find the setting of the Second Young Baptist International Congress held in Zurich in August, 1937. For hundreds of young Baptists it meant the deepening of existing friendships and the furthering of plans already partly developed. For others it was the beginning of a new international understanding, friendship and service. One thousand five hundred young Baptists from 27 countries were present. No less than 200

came from America. Sweden sent 55; Germany, 120; Great Britain, 432, and other countries were proportionally well represented. An enormous debt of gratitude is due to the Zurich Baptists for the sacrificial service they rendered to the delegates.

Dr. G. Truett, Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke, and Dr. W. O. Lewis and Dr. Gill were present, representing the senior Alliance, and young leaders of America and of the Continent as well as a few from the Orient, took part in the Congress. It is highly significant that so great a body of young people gathered from so many different countries should have passed unanimously resolutions dealing not only with matters affecting work in their own churches, but also with the grave and more general problems that confront the world today.

Although youth rose to the task with all the seriousness that age can command, there was no absence of good-humored fun and sport, and the value of the Congress itself was enormously augmented by the fellowship that was enjoyed in informal groups, in little parties at meals and in sightseeing in the city and environs. Three hundred delegates spent the week prior to the Congress in a fellowship holiday in the Black Forest, Germany, and another international party of the same size in the week following the Congress, enjoyed further fellowship amid the mountains around Interlaken.

This rapid survey is concerned with an ecumenical movement among our youth of immense possibilities. Every year an increasing number of our young people add to their national outlook a better international understanding. To them many another nation no longer means merely some vague and possibly hostile force but the country of young friends for whom they have deep respect and affection.

In these young people the Baptist World Alliance will find its ardent supporters of the future. They see the value and the necessity of such an alliance. Moreover, these friends having comprehended something of the whole, will now see better than ever before the significance of that part

that immediately engages them. Many returned from Zurich with a better understanding of, and a deeper zeal for, their work in the Sunday school, the Young People's Fellowship and the local church.

Above all in the gathering of many nations individual young Baptists saw something new of the Lord of lords. They became enriched in the sharing of spiritual experience and discovered something of that fulness of Christ which can be only "Comprehended with all Saints." So the stream of international friendship and service which arose in the springs of Stockholm and gathered force at Prague, has in passing through Zurich, found new depth and acceleration. So may it continue to flow for the service of man and to the praise of God.

The Meaning of Gethsemane

By Prof. Edward E. Richardson, Ph.D.

IT SEEMS hard to reconcile the apparent shrinking of the night spent here with what we think of Jesus' willingness to die, to give His life a ransom for the world. It may seem to some to be profane to enter into an analytical discussion of this experience; yet if those who believe in Him do not, others will. The surprise is that He, who had spoken almost in terms of rapture of His coming death, now seems appalled by its approach. He had said that He was to be glorified, and that if He be lifted up He would draw all men unto Him. In His conversation with His disciples He had regarded the dismal front of death without flinching; indeed it seemed almost as if welcomed. Why the seeming change?

The answer is not in the fact of death, for that had not changed, but in the circumstances under which it was now faced. This was not physical, but spiritual. Sin taking occasion had become exceedingly sinful, as is its wont. Sin is not merely passive, but is an active, malevolent force seeking to intensify itself whenever possible. What had it done here?

Let our thought return here to the previous condition. Jesus had spoken of His death before, and it was as if this was His free claim to accomplish a great end. He would indeed die, but this was His supreme choice for those whom He would free from the thraldom of sin. To so do was the real end of His being. However, as He then thought of it its agents and modes were not uppermost in His mind. It was its function that gave Him the exultation. The exultation follows from the fact and function of His death which was to be a boon to many. The exultation is most manifest when He is moved by love and pity for mankind and when His disciples seemed best to understand Him. These were times when he was least affected by human hate and His

spirit least scorched by the vindictive spirit that was gathering momentum as he faced the future, in the Garden. Now He confronts those who are to be the instruments of His death and He beholds the cruel malevolence with which they achieve this end. His mood changes. These are the wicked husbandmen, the foolish builders, the blind guides of which he had taught. Instead of being religious leaders as they professed to be, they were seen as hypocrites, as those who built the tombs of the old prophets and who would kill the new prophets—the living representatives of the only true religion. So he weeps over Jerusalem, moved by compassion for the city as He is conscious of the enmity that it harbors towards Him. Thus, while He could speak of His own death as such with benignant grace, the way of it, as it involved the human agents filled His compassionate, loving heart, with horror and dismay.

In Gethsemane his spirit suffers already at the hands of those whom He would help, would indeed save. They, by their perverse and intractable conduct are depriving him of those things that He sought most to do, that is, to save them from an awful fate. They were seeking to kill Him and in so doing were doing their utmost to undo what He wanted to do for them. They were showing themselves as children of the evil one who was a murderer from the beginning. The sanctity of His death would not sanctify the instruments, the agents by which it was to be accomplished. Instead of moving them to pity and love it was begetting in them a devilish spirit which threatened to undo all its good for them. Thus it seemed to be in vain. Before, it had been the objective contemplation of His death as a ransom for many, a boon to mankind, and this brought a real exultation. Now it was a subjective experience of the forces and agents by which it was to be brought about, and these agents were those whom He loved and wished most to help. No wonder there was a change of attitude, a different outlook, a fleshly shrinking. In foresight, the mode of death, its circumstances was subordinate to the idea. But in actuality, the idea was lost in the emotions which the mode engendered.

In foresight, He had seen ideal figures of priests, scribes and magistrates standing in their proper places and functioning in their proper way. These ideal figures stand for what ought to be. The priests should stand for the worship of God; the elders were the symbol that these were the people of God; the scribe was the ideal figure of those who made known the law of God, revealed God's way to the people; the magistrates, rulers, were there to guard freedom, to enforce a beneficent law to typify the right. But now it was all different. Priests had in actuality perverted the worship of God and had put barriers between.

His redemptive act now so near seemed to be the occasion for sin to become more heinous. It was becoming more exceedingly sinful and to intrude itself into his very act of redemptive grace; to envelop itself in His great sacrifice, thereby transmuting it from a free, gracious act into a violent necessitated death. His very act of overcoming sin was being made an occasion for it to be more malignant. Thus that which is most hateful to Him sought so to mix itself in His plans that it seemed to be a partner with Him in that which He wanted to do, and which He was doing because of His great love for mankind, and which would, He hoped, do away with sin by the flood of His grace. Sin was thwarting the real end of His work, turning it into "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense," when designed to help and to save. Those whom He wanted to save, and whom He was dying to save, were by their attitude making it infinitely harder for Him to save them.

His prayer was heard, in that the agonizing features of His death were removed. He suffered crucifixion, but He was not crucified against His will. He laid down His life of Himself. Those whom he was dying to save were those who were moving to encompass His death. Those whom He would make the objects of His saving grace were trying to change this into a sufficient cause of judgment instead of an efficient course of salvation. They might work their will, but His grace would be sufficient to move to repentance afterwards as they cried out on Pentecost: "Men and breth-

ren, what must we do to be saved?" He was looking forward to dying to save them, but their own actions were making it infinitely less probable that they would be saved.

The prayer of agony was heard. He died not in vain, although those who encompassed His death were by their heart-hardening course taking the heart out of what He was doing. In Gethsemane the will that triumphed broke the heart that could not bear to die at the hands of those whom He loved and for whom He wanted to die to save.

The conclusion is that He who would redeem man did become the Redeemer of the world on Calvary. His death was His own work and not that of sinners who sought His death. They might sin against His grace, but could not sin away His mercy or take from Him His most coveted privilege of giving His life a ransom for the world. He was named "Jesus" because He would save His people from their sins and this name was to be His in reality.

The Ideal Relations of Pastor and Layman

By Parke H. Custis

LIKE all ideals that are worth anything the ideal relations of pastor and layman are never realized and but seldom closely approached. As long as they deal with human nature as it exists in a considerable number of different individuals there will be more or less difference of opinion and of interpretation. For some reason it is impossible to get any large number of people to see things in the same light, even when they are honestly seeking the same ends.

Operating a church is a business; that is, a church must be carried on to achieve the purpose for which it was created just as any other undertaking in which man is engaged. The purpose may differ from that of a commercial undertaking, but if it is to be attained everything done should contribute to that end. Society has found certain methods essential to successful attainment. For the church to adopt these principles and methods is simply common sense.

To get at the ideal relations the effect of these principles and methods on the work of the church and the division of work between pastor and laymen must be considered. Conditions in different churches vary so widely that it is hard to define responsibilities in a way that will apply to all of them, but it should be possible to lay down a few general principles that will be useful anywhere.

Mutual Confidence

An effective work in any church must be based on mutual confidence on the part of the pastor and the laymen in the integrity and desire of each other to do the work for which the church was created. The pastor who attains to this confidence will find his people ready to forgive his mistakes and to overlook his failures. The minister who cannot obtain it should seek another parish at once. If a minister

finds the officers of his church unworthy of his confidence he should consider whether he will undertake to reorganize the official family—for the officers represent the church in carrying on the work—with all the difficulty, unpleasantness and risk of failure that such a course involves.

Spiritual Leadership

The one thing that no true pastor can avoid is the duty of spiritual leadership. If a man is unwilling to assume this duty or if he is incapable of fulfilling it he cannot be a true pastor. That is what the word pastor means. No layman can perform this function for him. A minister may be useful if he is a great preacher, but unless he is the spiritual leader he cannot be a real pastor. Spiritual leadership is what men seek in their churches today, and the failure of our ministers to give it is one cause and in most cases the great cause of the lack of influence of many churches that is so often the cause of criticism. Too much emphasis cannot be laid on this. Millions of men who have not found Christ and many who have believed at one time that they have found Him are groping in the dark spiritually. They turn to the ministers in our churches as specialists in the spiritual life. Unless they find there what they seek not only the church, but the religion of Jesus Christ is to them a failure.

The pastor should be the general manager of his church. This does not mean that he should be a dictator but it does mean that he should be responsible for getting the work done. It is just as true of a church as of a corporation that some individual must be responsible for all the various branches being coördinated and for seeing that each department head is getting the proper results from his department. To outsiders the pastor is the church, and by them he is held responsible for its success or failure. If he values his reputation he must insist on performing this function. On the other hand, directing the work presupposes that he knows what he wants done (a supposition that unfortunately fre-

quently seems to be contrary to fact), and that he knows how similar things have been done elsewhere.

A pastor should not himself attempt to do everything that needs to be done nor should he try to decide all questions. He owes it to his people to make them take some part of the burden and the responsibility. He should know how to get others to carry out his plans. His part should be to make plans and formulate policies. Often it will seem easier to do what needs to be done than to get some one else to do it, but the only way to develop strong members is to put responsibility on them. In other words he should have executive ability, a quality not possessed by every minister, let alone every layman. If he lacks organizing ability he can probably work best through one or two of his laymen, putting on them the burden of organizing the membership, but unless he knows what he wants done he is likely to become the tool of others who know what they want.

On the other hand, if he tries to decide all questions himself he will probably fail. He must have the support of his people and should decide important matters of policy only after consultation with his leaders. If he has not the support of his officers in a matter of policy he should either drop it or convince them, or in extreme cases present the matter to the church and secure the selection of new officers who will work with him. This last course is likely to be fraught with much danger and should be followed in very extreme cases only. It is almost sure to cause a split in the church.

Willingness to Help

Now for the layman's part in establishing the ideal relations. If he is a true disciple of Jesus Christ he will be ready at all times to do whatever he can to advance the interests of the kingdom. He will be ready not only with his advice but also with his labor. When a policy has been settled upon he will do everything he can to give it a fair trial. He will constantly use his influence to get others to support the pastor actively.

Integrity and Dependability

The pastor has a right to expect from every one of his laymen integrity and dependability. The layman who lacks these is worse than useless—he is a positive detriment. The pastor will hope for good judgment, tact and the many other qualities which help to make the work run smoothly, but these two he will require. Yet many a man agrees to do a certain piece of work because he has not the moral courage to say no, and then never moves a finger to get that work done; or he accepts an important committee assignment and puffs up with pride over the "honor"—mistakenly considering such an assignment an honor and not a job—and then never lifts more than his voice to assist the committee. The pastor must realize that most of his laymen have a limited amount of time at their disposal, and that they must attend to business if they are to have means to support the church; but once he has a man's promise to get a thing done he should not have to give it another thought. A layman who fails to perform his tasks has no right to be offended if he finds others put on important committees while he is dropped, or relegated to minor places where his failures will not cause embarrassment.

A Co-worker

Again, the layman should consider that he is a co-worker with his pastor and that these are things that he can do which the minister cannot. For example, there is always the Sunday school with its great opportunities, the ushers (a thankless job, but a very important one) and committees with various duties—some of them small, perhaps, in themselves, but nevertheless very important to the satisfactory conduct of the church and its services. There is a view widely held by certain types of mind that church offices are honors which should be apportioned among those who attend services regularly. Closely associated with this attitude is the theory that has done so much damage in our Government as well as in our churches, that any member can fill any office. Every one who has been interested in the work of a church has seen the misfits resulting from the practical working out

of these theories. It is perfectly true that satisfactory results are rarely obtained by putting into office a man who is not interested in the church; but many members who, for one reason or another, cannot attend every service have a very deep interest in the work and gladly give very valuable services if the appeal is properly made. "He is a wise man who knows his own limitations."

The pastor has a right to expect his laymen to put into office the men who are exceptionally well fitted to perform the particular duties of those offices. Ideal and impracticable do you say? Ideal it is true and impracticable in many cases, but not impracticable if the members really have the spirit of the Master—and we are talking of ideals.

Financial Support

It is the duty of every layman to support the church financially carrying a part of the load according to his means. Probably every one admits this; yet every church has members who are willing to let others carry all the load. This condition may be expected to continue as long as men and women are human. We all know the woman who lives in luxury and travels where fancy dictates; the man who belongs to expensive clubs and who gives much time and labor to their affairs; the family who must go to the movies once or twice a week, but who when asked to contribute to the work of their church "cannot do it" and who are disturbed because "the church is always asking for money." What such people need is tactful and persistent education. Here is a mutual obligation: the pastor must show such people their duty and the people must realize that they are being called on for money because they are not fulfilling their obligations and must recognize their accountability to God. Without this mutual understanding ideal relations cannot exist.

In the foregoing paragraphs the personal relations have not been touched upon. It goes without saying that the closer the personal relations the better provided these relations are the same with all. This is a delicate matter which can be far better discussed by the pastor than by the layman.

The Layman and Doctrinal Questions

By Thornley B. Wood

"Take heed—unto the doctrine" (1 Tim. 4: 16).

SUSPENDED 300 feet in the air, dangling over the face of a granite cliff known as the Behistun Rock, Persian daredevils, at the direction of Darius, inscribed in the cuneiform characters of that day, exploits and achievements of that great monarch.

Written about 510 B. C., in three different languages (Babylonian, Susian and Persian), it was not until 1851 that a portion of this message was deciphered and given to the world through the heroic efforts of Sir Henry Rawlinson—2,300 years and more from the time it was written until the world at large caught the message—it seems almost incredible. Yet, I have before me another message of far greater import, written more than 1,900 years ago, which men more heroic than Rawlinson have, down through the ages, endeavored to make plain and yet it too has escaped the world at large. In fact, it has been borne home to but a pitiably small number of the folks in the church.

Doctrinal questions? Are they only for the pulpit? God forbid. Spiritually considered and discussed by laymen and the folks in the pew generally they will prove both welcome and stimulating to the pastor everywhere.

If there is one need standing out above another in the business administration of our churches today it is for laymen—laymen dedicated to the Word of God and enlightened as to the teachings of the Word on the great doctrines contained therein.

Speaking from personal experience I know of no single influence that wrought a greater change in my own life than an intelligent knowledge of God's Word. For years a nominal church member I had a veritable reintroduction to the Lord when, through the ministry of a Bible school near by I learned something of the great truths in His Word; learned

them, not in cloudy and high-sounding theological terms of doubtful academic or spiritual value, but, in the everyday understandable terms of the Bible itself.

Anthropology—how difficult it sounds—until we find it simply relates to the science of man, or more particularly in the Bible school, what the Bible teaches about man. And so with

Hamartology (What the Word teaches of sin)

Soteriology (What the Word teaches of salvation)

and so on.

An earnest consideration of these things and speedily the Bible became a new book. When I learned that in "the seed of the woman" and "let there be light" words of Genesis, we had the first germ hints of the Messiah, then truly I decided my ignorance of the Word was great indeed. When I learned that God used no less than four channels through which to bring humans into the world; i. e.:

1. The normal channel—the male and female.
2. Neither male or female (Gen. 2: 7).
3. Male only (Gen. 2: 21-22).
4. The female only (Mat. 2).

I no longer was concerned with any discussion or difficulty over the virgin birth.

You say to me, "The average layman is already too busy to devote the time to an intelligent study of these doctrinal questions." I reply, "No business or movement should be allowed to crowd Jesus out, certainly not with Christian laymen." The inn-keeper at Bethlehem is not the only person who has missed eternal distinction because "there was no room in the inn."

The question arises: Does not the knowledge of these great truths of the Bible—Christian doctrines, if you please—create strife and controversy between pastor and layman, causing the former to say with Festus of old, "Much learning doth make thee mad?" Not so! The layman with a mind really enlightened toward God and not simply "flat-sided" on some one subject, a man gripped by the "whole counsel of God," becomes, not controversial but Christian;

a potential source of assistance and activity in the church program. One's mind turns irresistibly to that doughty warrior against whom Festus thundered, "Paul, thou art raving," and we thrill again as we note the majestic calm with which he replies, "I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak forth the words of truth and soberness." Whence came this conviction of truth? It came surely from an experience born of God *plus* a knowledge of the plan and program of His Word.

And was Paul willing but weakminded, intrepid but ignorant? By no means. "A citizen of no mean city . . . freeborn," with university training—"a Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law blameless." Yet with all this tinsel of earth of which he might well boast before men, see him as he thrust it all on the ash heap "that he might know Him." Hear him as he proudly says, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ my Lord." And so speaks the layman taught in the Christian doctrines, grounded in the Word of God. With a new book comes a new vision and with the new vision, a new urge.

It is a firm conviction of mine that the Bible nowhere places a premium on ignorance; and with this conviction, few, I believe, will argue. The desire for learning and a trained mind is growing by leaps and bounds, as evidenced by the growth and expansion of universities, seminaries and colleges everywhere. The daily press just records record-breaking student enrolment countrywide.

This is splendid, but why in God's name is not the man in the pew just as anxious to acquaint himself with things Scriptural, when I reiterate, the one outstanding need in our churches everywhere is the need—yes the dire need—of an enlightened leadership apart from the ministry.

Analyze the laymen, the leaders, in almost any church (there are some exceptions, of course) and see what percentage of them have a "working knowledge" of the Word of God. How many of them can give a distressed and seeking soul a clear-cut explanation of the Bible doctrine of salvation? How many of them know anything about church

history? And if this be true of our church leaders, what shall we say of the great group of loyal but nonactive church members?

I protest these are not "doctrines" and subjects necessary only to the pastor. I maintain, on the contrary, that a knowledge of these things will lead to a better understanding of the pastor's problems, a closer friendship, a more wondrous Christian fellowship on the part of the pastor and his active helpers, yea, his entire constituency. Solomon of old said, "Get wisdom and with all thy getting get understanding." This intelligent understanding of God's Word I reiterate is possible only through a knowledge of the "doctrines." I have before me an article written about 25 years ago by one of America's truly great preachers—recounting a discussion at Winona (the participants were American preachers—several of them famous). He says:

> But we came at last to full agreement upon the point at issue—the essential respect in which the best English and American preaching was at one, and in which it differed radically from most present-day American preaching—it was agreed that the one quality common to all great preaching was that it was "intensely Biblical."

Describing the discussion further, he wrote:

> "And another said: 'That is it; the best preachers of the English and American pulpits have been deeper students of the English Bible than we. Their minds are full of it. Whatever the theme, we are made to feel the whole of the truth about it.' "

After calling attention to the fact that certain subjects in the course of training for the ministry are not themselves sermon stuff, although "necessary disciplines," he continues:

> The young minister dismayed by that discovery is in peril—peril of becoming a mere text hunter or worse, a feverish reader of other men's thoughts. Instead of being a first-hand witness he becomes a mere echo-man. He comes to have a "barrel" and drifts from church to church with it. The sheep of God are unfed and he knows it. There is but one remedy—a thorough, comprehensive spiritual study of the whole Bible. No royal road leads to that knowledge; no study of commentaries will suffice. The Bible itself must be studied.

If the foregoing be true—and it is—do I go too far when I say the layman's need is equally as acute and the remedy exactly the same?

Need I say more? Only to add that such a study pays "big dividends." The delight in a Bible made new—the satisfaction in being able to say, "I know"—the thrill of a genuine understanding—and, best and greatest of all, a real ability to guide another aright.

"Understandest thou what thou readest?" said Deacon Philip, a layman, to the Ethiopian. "How can I except some man guide me" was the reply. Then Philip began at the same Scripture—did you get it, the same Scripture, and preached unto him—Jesus.

Can *you do it,* layman friend? If not, give doctrines—the Bible —*God's* Word, a chance, for as Frederick Bettex says:

It is not an ordinary Book. With sublime freedom it strides through the history of mankind, dismisses entire nations with a glance, with a word, in order to tarry a long time with the deeds of a shepherd—records seemingly unimportant genealogies—now it speaks of God as playing with his creatures and delighting in the daring chamois, the snorting horse, and the beautiful lily; now it rises like an eagle to heights that make peoples, passing hither and thither, appear like swarms of grasshoppers, yea, all nations like a drop in a bucket. This word tells of a coat of many colors that a father made for his favorite son; and is silent concerning the life and efforts of Isaiah or John, and the martyrdom of Paul. It raises deepest questions, as if they were but trifles: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" It condenses into a single word a sweeping view of the world: "The things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." It reveals vast counsels of the Lord, that He will make a new heaven and a new earth, where old things shall no longer rise in the hearts of men. What book is there written by man that does not grow trite from repeated readings? But of this Book thousands of the best and most talented among men have testified, not only that they never tired of reading and studying it, but also that it constantly grew grander, richer, more unfathomable. How often some unseeming word, that you have read a hundred times, suddenly opens up, revealing its deep, hidden meaning! If every sentence, yea, every word in the Bible that has been important or beneficial to this soul or that were underscored, would a single one be found, that had been written uselessly and without purpose, or that had borne no fruit? I think not.

The Bible, the Word of God, reveals to us this invisible God, whom mankind feels in, about, and above itself; in whom the child exultingly believes; whom the adult seeks and finds, loves, hates, worships, denies, to whom he prays and whom he curses; whom the dying aged hope to see, or concerning whom they try with quaking hearts to ease their minds, saying, "There is no God!" In the beginning God created the heaven and the

earth. The Bible does not deal with fools, whose heart's desire is, There is no God. It is not necessary to demonstrate God. Whoever is foolish enough to close his eyes and deny Him, may do so at his own risk; he will not harm Him, but himself. In the beginning of His Word, God steps forth out of His eternity, grand and resplendent, the ground, principle, and cause of the universe, the Creator of creation, He who, in incomprehensible omnipotence, creates, and there is no one who could say, Why doest thou thus? At the close of His Word, where a new eternal creation begins, heavenly creatures and powers cast their crowns at His feet, crying: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Alleulia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!

Men's Clubs and Bible Classes and the Churches

By George W. Schroeder

MEN'S Bible classes and men's clubs have been a strong arm in support of the local church. The most flourishing Bible classes and clubs are those that have good leadership and engage in definite Christian service tasks.

There is certainly need to have these two groups in the local church today. The big problem seems to be to secure a consecrated Christian man who will lead and take the initiative in starting one of these groups. The men's Bible classes that flourish most, not only study the Word of God but put its precepts and teachings into practice through Christian service. There are many practical ways in which they are relating themselves to the local church.

One of the most active Bible classes in Philadelphia is interested in religious and social work outside the church limits. Baskets of provisions and clothing are sent out to needy families. The class takes care of the Saturday night service in one of the rescue missions. It helps financially an orphanage and is endowing a bed in a hospital. It is helping to educate a young man for the Christian ministry. It goes in a body to a smaller class in another church and gives it a boost. Flowers are sent to the sick. Young men are helped in securing positions. The class takes the Sunday evening and Wednesday prayer service several times during the church year. Is it any wonder that this class has an enrolment of more than 350?

The Social Side

Men's clubs give the men of the church the opportunity of meeting together socially. One of the men's clubs in Philadelphia has once a month a night that is called "Food, Faith and Fun Night." First there is a supper, and, following, a social time of singing and social activities. Finally

there is the religious message by a layman or minster that culminates a happy evening spent together.

The success of a men's club, like the Bible class, depends largely on the leadership. Secure a consecrated Christian leader and have a real objective to render Christian service for the men of the church and the community.

The Service Side

The men's club can serve the church in many ways. A real practical one is to take care of the ushering on Sunday and have a lookout committee on hand to greet the stranger to endeavor to make him feel at home.

They can be a "Big Brother" to the boys of the church. Help them in the building up of the Boy Scout troop or the boys' organization in that church. Through athletics they can assist the boys and young men by organizing baseball, basketball and other athletic teams.

Father-and-Son week also offers a fine opportunity of bringing the boy and his father closer together and influencing them to be loyal to the church. Many a father has been won for Christ through the invitation of his boy to go with him to a father-and-son dinner at the church.

The men's club can wield a big influence in promoting a real respect for the proper observance of the Lord's Day. Many are active in helping temperance and Anti-Saloon League activities, the distribution of Testaments and the assisting in mission work.

Several Challenges

There are real challenges that confront the men's Bible classes and men's clubs at the present time:

First.—Reach out into the community and show the non-church going man that you are interested in him. Too often we are satisfied to bring into these two groups only the men who are members of the church or those whom we can influence to come without much trouble. Take the parents of the children who attend the Sunday school. They send their children but often never come themselves. Here is a real home mission field. Let us go after them in the home.

Make the home Christian and the church will have no fear of the future.

Second.—Hold the young men from eighteen to thirty years of age in the church. Why is it that at about sixteen years of age the young man quits the Sunday school? We hear a great deal about "What ails our youth?" but why not ask, "What ails our church?" Go after these young men personally and find out why they do not come around. Give them a real part in church work and place them on church boards. Talk with them personally. You will find they are interested in spiritual things and want to have a part in the ministry of the church.

Third.—Jesus called men. Men are needed as never before in the great tasks that confront the Church of Christ at the present time. Let us go after men personally and win them for the Christian life. A leading Christian business man said the other day, "The greatest field for evangelism today is in the business world." What a revival would spread among our churches if only a small group of Christian men in each church would call on business men and talk to them personally about the King's business and win them for the Christian life.

A Christian business man who was ill called on a specialist. Among the questions that the specialist asked him was, "What do you do with your leisure time?" He answered, "Well, I do a good bit of Christian work and speaking." The specialist asked, "Why do you, a business man do that?" He replied, "Several years ago I made a discovery. I found God." The specialist then said to him, "Do you know for fifteen years I have been trying to find God." For almost two hours that Christian business man and the specialist talked about the Christian life. Finally when the business man was leaving the specialist said, "If you will help me to find God I will do my best to help you to get well."

Helping men to find God and doing the King's business is the biggest challenge and task before our men's clubs and Bible classes today.

An Experience With the Oxford Group

By the Editor

LOOKING back across the years I find that I have had the privilege of attending nine great international religious gatherings. One of them met at Denver, one at Detroit, one at Boston, two at Oxford (in 1934 and 1937), two at Edinburgh (in 1910 and 1937), one in the city of Tokyo, Japan, and one in Shanghai, China. Every one of these gatherings was picturesque, impressive, and remarkable for the consecration and zeal, and for the permeative spirit of hearty Christian fellowship that prevailed; and every one, I believe, was productive of large and definite spiritual results. Of all of these gatherings, the one that affected me most profoundly in a personal way, and that exhibited most clearly the divine fervor of a simple and stedfast evangelical faith, was the International House Party of the Oxford Groups, which brought together two thousand representatives from all parts of the world.

Dr. J. C. Carlile, the editor of *The Baptist Times* of London, had received a special invitation to be present at the Conference. He was unable to attend, so he very kindly asked me to take his place, and furnished me with the necessary credentials. It was an experience to be cherished in memory forever.

Being busy with many duties here and there, I had known very little about those modern crusaders who have come to create such a stir in the world, and who have been variously called "Buchmanites," "Life-Changers," "The Oxford Group," and "The First-Century Fellowship."

A New Order

My first experience was a delightful one, for I was given a hearty welcome by two fine-spirited young men who were members of the company of Oxford and Cambridge under-

graduates who were looking after the comfort of the guests and the success of the gathering. The next person that I met was a professor from an American university; the next a man from South Africa, who is a Group leader; the next an educationist from Nova Scotia. And so it went throughout the days of my sojourn. Everywhere the atmosphere of Christian fellowship and friendliness prevailed. Who can describe an atmosphere, except by indicating its effects? and the effects in this case were refreshing, vitalizing, inspiring.

Now let me state the general conviction born of my experiences throughout the days spent at Oxford. I believe that the Groups constitute a new and powerful religious movement in the life of the world. They represent the greatest and most effective spiritual undertaking since the founding of the Salvation Army in the third quarter of the last century. In their appeals and "confessions," in their joy and deep earnestness, in their subordination of the form to the spirit, the Group is similar to the Army.

In one of the meetings at Oxford, the wife of Commissioner Lamb, who has herself engaged for many years in a wonderful life-saving work among poor women in East London, said: "Why, you are just like the Salvationists! It was my greatest joy to lead my women into the blessing of holiness. This also is your purpose, and I am sure you can join with me in saying, 'and the sight that charms me most is a sinner at the Cross.'" In motive and spirit the two agree; in organization, methods and clientele they differ quite profoundly.

Aims, Principles, Practices

The aims of the Group are, briefly, to secure the realization of the power of the Holy Spirit as a force for spiritual and material stability throughout the world, to create in us the knowledge that we are superficializing our spiritual inheritance, that Sin is frustrating God's Plan for us all, and that we must surrender all things to Him in order to conquer sin and create a new world-order.

The keys to the spiritual life are the principles of Absolute Honesty, Purity, Unselfishness and Love. The Group is thus definitely ethical as well as powerfully spiritual. It may be asked, in passing, whether the principle of unselfishness is not completely involved in that of love, and whether the omission of the principle of trust or faith does not need considerable explaining.

The standardized practices of the Group (if I may be allowed to use the word "standardized") seem to be those of Surrender, Sharing, Restitution, and Guidance. The Quiet Hour is a larger application of the practice of sharing; it also offers the opportunity for public surrender and opens the doors of the life to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

A New Emphasis

Here is no new Gospel, but rather a new outlook, a new vocabulary, a new interpretation, and a renewed energy that carries us back in thought to the joyous and confident attitude of the Early Church.

It is largely a Youth Movement. A brilliant young woman said very earnestly at one meeting: "I had been accustomed to look upon Bishops as isolated and picturesque pinnacles, to be adored with reverence from afar. Young people today have great spiritual ambitions. They are ready to be challenged by the Church and its clergy. We have the welfare of the Church truly at heart, but we claim the right on our part to challenge the Church and the clergy on matters wherein they err or are indifferent. We still admire the flowers, the vestments, the entertainments, the ceremonies; but we believe that there is need for the Church to be brought into vital human relationships and into every problem of life, with the Cross leading on as we all march forward. Pious language, the ancient vocabulary, is very beautiful, but modern young people do not understand its accents. When I came back to the Church through the Group, the flaming passion of my life was to bring my friends and others to Christ, so I had to use the straight and simple language that they know."

Doctrines

The Group does not use technical doctrinal terms, but, if one may judge by the flood of testimonies and confessions uttered at Oxford during those thrilling days, these people come very near to being orthodox Fundamentalists. One of the leaders said: "Facing up to the Cross as the moving factor in the life of the individual and of the Church is the mission of the Group."

I asked the question of a prominent Anglican layman, a man of wealth and education, and a leader in the Group: "Do you make much of the fact of the Atonement?" He answered instantly: "We may not often use the word, but we believe in the fact; why, it is *everything* with us. Personally, if I had not found this faith in the Atonement vital and basic in the principles of the Group, I could never have had fellowship with it." In view of the many criticisms that have been made of the Group, without definite knowledge, this attitude should be understood by people in general. The Cross and its saving power were constantly emphasized in the Quiet Hour and in the evening testimony meetings.

The evils of sin suffer no toleration. One meeting was given over entirely to a consideration of this topic, and some mighty plain words were spoken. There is a tendency, I believe, to place too great and continued stress upon the minor sins, such as self-consciousness, petty pride and ignorant criticism of others; but the greater sins, both those of the world and those of the flesh, come in for the most scathing condemnation.

Although there is a somewhat startling elimination of the theological emphasis, the great truths of Scripture are set forth in a keen and noble fashion. The power of the supernatural receives full recognition. A splendid-looking young Oxford graduate said: "We are hindered by trivial thinking. The scholar is not apt to be the 'doer.' We need Christian thinkers with 'push' and 'vim.' Christ died to give us supernatural power. The sin of many of us Christians is that we do not live on a miracle plane, when we know that

nothing but a miracle can save the world. We must give ourselves utterly to Jesus Christ, for God cannot get through to us except through Him."

The World-View

I was surprised at the number of expressions of intense interest in broad questions of civic, social, national and international character. Concerning this I said to Dr. Buchman: "I had thought of this Movement as quite highly individualistic, in spite of its Sharing principle. Is this zeal for social and political improvement a new development?" He replied: "By no means. It has been with us from the very beginning. Already it has been reaching whole sections of Society." From the words of the founder, of Dr. Maurice of South Africa, and of others, I came to realize that the Groups are hoping for "a Church Totalitarianism" that shall influence all aspects of human life, all areas of human thought, and enlist all the forces of Christianity.

In South Africa "it has assumed the dimensions of a national movement," and has accomplished more than all other agencies combined to bring about racial comity. As one of the leaders at Oxford expressed it: "The world-wide sweep of the Christ, which means world-revolution, is our constant and motivating aim."

Testimony Meetings

Three of the most attractive items in the Group idea are those of Fellowship; All-Outness ("all of us out, all the time, in all places, for all men, in Christ's name"); and Teamwork. The Fellowship feature shows admirably in the testimony or confession or surrender meetings. I never expected to live to see a high-placed dignitary of the Anglican Church, such as the Metropolitan of India, lead what amounted to a Methodist class-meeting or a Baptist covenant-meeting; nevertheless this is what I have really seen. "Come! Declare your decisions in the presence of witnesses!" he kept saying; and "I want to hear more of these confessions of surrender."

And they kept coming along, surrenders or resurrenders of human hearts and lives; those, for instance, of a young Englishman and his wife, a lawyer from New York, the managing director of an old-established English business-house, a bank clerk, a medical student, a sweet-looking young girl, a Civil Service official from Ottawa, a medical specialist from Boston, a middle-aged lady from London, and many more.

The Anglican Bishop of Chota-Nagpur in India said: "I have been a priest and missionary for 43 years; a Bishop for eight years. I do not believe that I have ever brought a soul to Christ. I register tonight my complete surrender to Christ. I go back to India to win men for Christ." A man of imposing presence, he spoke with trembling voice and with great humility.

The Ruling Motive

Let me close by repeating a few most significant words used by Dr. Frank Buchman in explaining to me the work of the Oxford Group. "The quality of Life in Christ lies at the very heart of our Movement. Everything is subordinate to the quest for this, and the effort to interpret it to others." Do we realize the significance of these words? It is not quantity, or mechanistic efficiency, or formal belief, or excellent organization, or even zeal in service, but quality of life that really counts. The highest possible quality of life is that which derives directly from Christ. This life the Oxford Group seeks to win, and to communicate.

Baptists and Foreign Missions

By the Editor

BAPTISTS have stood at the very head and front of the modern missionary movement. As in earlier centuries Baptists were world leaders in the mighty struggle for religious liberty, so in the nineteenth century they were leaders in the holy enterprise of world-wide missions. They were the first in the foreign field with their missionaries; they were first in Bible translation work, first in the formation of mission schools, first in the winning of converts for Christ and His Church.

Baptists were pioneers in organization. They formed in 1792, at Kettering, England, the first foreign missionary society of modern times. They established the first Bible society in the world in 1804, several months before the inauguration of the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The first Sunday school in India was begun by Baptists in 1803, and in 1821 the first Christian college in all the East was founded at Serampore by Carey and his colleagues.

Baptists have been pioneers in Bible translation. Dr. Marshman, after devoting eighteen years to the work, published his Chinese Bible nearly two years before Dr. Morrison's translation appeared. Carey and Marshman were the first to translate the Scriptures into forty of the languages and dialects of India. Baptists were the first to give the Scriptures, in whole or in part, to the Burmans, the Karens, the Siamese, the Assamese, the Telugus, the Visayan population of the Philippines, and the people of the Congo Valley. They were also the first to issue the New Testament in the Japanese vernacular. Over the greater part of the vast continent of Asia, containing nearly one-half the population of the globe, Baptist missionaries were the first to bring the Book to the people.

Baptists have given great men and women to this great work. Carey and Marshman and Ward in Northern In-

dia; Clough and Jewett among the Telugus; the Judsons, the Boardmans, and the Vintons in Burma; Dean and Ashmore, R. H. Graves and Timothy Richards in China; Nathan Brown in Japan; Lott Carey, Alfred Saker and the Combers in Africa, are a few of the many names that adorn the royal roster of Baptist saints and heroes in "the regions beyond." To these might be added the names of a multitude of native preachers, teachers, evangelists and converts whose consecrated lives bear witness to the power and glory of the gospel.

Baptists have seen noble ingatherings. The nineteenth century began with just one Christian convert from heathenism. This single convert was a Baptist, and he was baptized three days before the century opened. After Dr. Carey had been in India for six years he baptized this man, a Hindu carpenter, on December 29, 1800. His name was Krishna Pal. He became a succesful preacher among his own people, the writer of many widely circulated tracts, and the author of several tender and beautiful hymns, one of which in translation begins:

> Oh thou, my soul, forget no more
> The Friend who all thy sorrows bore.

Krishna Pal was the first of a mighty multitude whom no man can number. Not only by ones and twos but often by hundreds and thousands converts have been won. The Pentecost of the Congo in 1886 constitutes one of the remarkable exhibitions of the power of the Holy Spirit. In the Telugu field in 1878 nearly 10,000 persons were baptized, and the greater part of these remained faithful. The year 1890 witnessed another revival of unusual power. In the Shan mission in Eastern Bengal 10,000 converts were baptized within twelve years. Large numbers of the Visayan peasants in the Philippines became Christians within a short time after the first preaching of the gospel.

Baptists have made generous gifts to foreign missions. The first contribution to the cause was a collection taken at the memorable conference at Kettering, when twelve men

organized The Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen. It amounted to thirteen pounds, two shillings, six pence, or about sixty-five dollars. As time has gone on, as interest in missions has deepened, as the field of work has broadened until it includes all lands and all peoples, as the number of missionary societies has grown from one to hundreds, the consecrated gift of that group of great-hearted Englishmen, that little company of twelve modern apostles, gathered in the back parlor of Mrs. Beebe Wallace's house in Kettering, has increased in amazing fashion.

Baptists have exercised a many-sided ministry. They have hospitals with physicians and nurses; publishing houses with able managers and skilled employees; schools and colleges with devoted instructors; theological institutions for the training of native preachers and teachers; zenana work for women, and industrial work of various kinds. All these forms of service are additional to the churches and outstations, with their Sunday schools, prayer meetings, Christian Endeavor societies, Baraca classes, temperance societies, mothers' meetings, and such other kinds of helpful activity as circumstances suggest. There are many kindergartens, primary schools, village schools, station boarding schools, training schools and high schools. In Burma there is a thoroughly organized Christian educational system "from jungle-school to college."

Baptists have done constructive work. They have sought to develop strongly and symmetrically the different departments of missionary service. They have aimed at solid growth, and the conduct of their missions has been almost entirely free from shallow and spasmodic effort.

Baptists have been persistent advocates of educational agencies on the field. The church and the school have been planted side by side in every mission. It is true that the emphasis has usually been laid much more strongly on evangelism than on education, and that higher education has been neglected in some stations and pursued feebly in several others. It must be remembered, however, that in the early

developments of every missionary undertaking evangelistic endeavor is quite necessarily the predominant interest. It must also be borne in mind that the funds furnished by the home churches, though large in the aggregate, have been utterly insufficient to provide for the erection of adequate educational institutions. The missionaries have been compelled to make bricks without straw. The results that they have accomplished with the money which the home churches have supplied border on the miraculous.

Baptists have perpetuated on foreign soil the simple and virile principles of primitive Christianity. Their hatred of ceremonialism; their repudiation of elaborate religious schemes and systems; their insistence on the direct use of the New Testament by the individual believer, and their passionate desire to receive and transmit the true spirit of Jesus, led them, very early in the days of the new missionary awakening to enter with productive purpose the field of world-wide evangelization.

They have been notably successful. No other denomination has so many converts on the foreign field today. As in our Republic Baptist ideas have found a welcome and fertile soil, so that the membership of the churches has increased from 173,000 in 1813 to 1,500,000 in 1873, and to more than 10,000,000 today, so in the midst of the awakening world, weary of the ignorance and tyranny of ages, the Baptists have found the nations and peoples ready to listen to the gospel interpreted in its simplest and most straightforward terms. Baptist principles, Baptist policy, and Baptist ways of worship have proved their efficiency times without number on the foreign field. The teachings of Baptists are those of freedom, faith and fellowship. Their methods are simple and direct; their spirit is evangelical and sympathetic. So their missionary work has been democratic, practical and spiritual. Thus they have won the hearts of the common people of all lands.

Baptists have encouraged a spirit of comity on mission fields. They have been singularly free from unbrotherly and selfish tactics; they have avoided entering fields al-

ready occupied by other missionary bodies; they have scorned the rôle of the proselyte. On the other hand, they have been in many cases far more open-eyed than the people at home in their attitude toward the central and vital interests of the kingdom. They have favored union work as far as that has been possible.

Baptists have now an unequalled opportunity for aggressive work. The nations of the earth are restless, expectant, discontented. Revolutionary movements are widespread. The old order is passing. On the other hand, the pioneer work of the church has now been completed among the most of these awakening peoples. Foundations have been laid. The labor of translation has been achieved. Missions, with their varied equipment and various auxiliary agencies, have been planted. The Christian missionary has such a chance as he never had before. Baptists, by virtue of their principles, their history and their polity are peculiarly fitted to take advantage of the amazing opportunity that now presents itself, and to become the stalwart and invincible leaders in a world-wide campaign of conquest in the name of Jesus Christ for the redemption of humanity. It is now or never! The responsibility cannot in honor be evaded or postponed. The issue of defeat or victory rests with the Baptist churches of America.

Our Contributors

The Leading Article in this issue is contributed by Rev. Jacob Gartenhaus, who is Field Secretary for Jewish Evangelism of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. Dr. E. E. Richardson, whose name is familiar to our readers, is Professor of Philosophy in the George Washington University, Washington, D. C. Dr. T. G. Dunning is Director of the Young People's Department of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, and therefore speaks with authority concerning the great Baptist youth movement which is growing rapidly. A number of articles have been contributed to the pages of THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW by Dr. William A. Mueller, professor of Church History in The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary. This summer he is traveling in Europe doing research work in the field of theological education.

We believe that our readers will be interested in the group of articles by three of our leading Baptist laymen. Mr. Parke H. Custis, of Brookline, Mass., has for a number of years been treasurer and chairman of the Finance Committee, and chairman of the Board of Deacons of the First Baptist Church, Boston. He is a trustee of the Newton Theological Institution, and a Director of the Massachusetts State Convention. Mr. Thornley B. Wood, of Philadelphia, is Assistant Manager of the Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware Department of the Employers Liability Assurance Corporation of London. He is a deacon and trustee of the Wissinoming Church. Mr. George W. Schroeder is at the present time Program and Service Secretary of the Philadelphia Branch of the Y. M. C. A., and has been actively engaged in work with that Branch for about twenty-five years.

THE EASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

1808-1818 South Rittenhouse Square

Philadelphia, Pa.

"The primary objective of the Seminary shall be to prepare adequately for Christian service through the church; preachers, pastors, evangelists, missionaries, and teachers, who intend to devote their lives to the spread of the Gospel, with loyalty to the doctrines which the Seminary has set forth in its Doctrinal Basis."

FACULTY OF INSTRUCTION

GORDON PALMER, D.D.
President

AUSTEN KENNEDY DE BLOIS, PH.D., D.D., LL.D.
President Emeritus

WILLIAM W. ADAMS, TH.D.
Professor of New Testament Interpretation

HARRY WATSON BARRAS, D.D.*
Professor of Homiletics

L. SARLE BROWN, B.S.M.
Director of School of Sacred Music

JOSEPH R. BOWMAN, B.S.M.
Assistant, School of Sacred Music

JOHN B. CHAMPION, A.M., TH.D.
Professor of Christian Doctrine

DONALD R. GORHAM, D.R.E., PH.D.
Director of School of Christian Education

W. EVERETT GRIFFITHS, TH.D.
Assistant Professor of Old Testament

ARTHUR EMERSON HARRIS, D.D.
Professor of Psychology, Registrar and Director of Extension Division

DAVID LEE JAMISON, LL.B., TH.D.
Professor of Philosophy of Religion

BENJAMIN T. LIVINGSTON, D.D.
Professor of Evangelism

JAMES A. MAXWELL, D.D.
Professor of English Bible

CARL HAMILTON MORGAN, A.M., TH.D.
Director of Collegiate Department

WILLIAM A. MUELLER, A.M., PH.D.
Professor of Church History and Missions

BARNARD C. TAYLOR, D.D.*
Professor of Old Testament Interpretation

DEAN OF WOMEN

IRENE ANN JONES, A.M.
Instructor in Collegiate Department

INSTRUCTORS

MRS. WILBER T. ELMORE
Instructor in Missions

VIRGINIA SNYDER
Instructor in Piano

HARRY ALEXANDER MATTHEWS, MUS.D.
Instructor in Theory of Music

MAE DEAL SHANE, M.R.E.
School of Christian Education

ROBERT G. TORBET, M.A., B.D.,
Collegiate Department

* Deceased.